

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

EDYTA GRYGLAK,

Case No. 2:17-CV-1514 JCM (NJK)

Plaintiff(s).

ORDER

V.

HSBC BANK USA, N.A., et al.,

Defendant(s).

13 Presently before the court is the matter of *Gryglak v. HSBC Bank USA, N.A., et al*, case no.
14 2:17-cv-01514-JCM-NJK.

15 On December 20, 2018, the parties filed a “stipulation and order to extend deadline for
16 defendants to respond to plaintiff’s opposition to defendants’ motion for summary judgment and
17 countermotion for summary judgment.” (ECF No. 61). For the following reasons, the stipulation
18 is denied.

19 On September 13, 2018, defendants HSBC Bank USA, N.A., Wells Fargo Asset Securities
20 Corporation, and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (collectively, “defendants”) filed their motion for
21 summary judgment. (ECF No. 45). On November 13, 2018, plaintiff Edyta Gryglak (“plaintiff”)
22 filed her response to defendants’ motion. (ECF No. 56). However, at the end of her response,
23 plaintiff included a purported “counter-motion” for summary judgment against defendants. *See*
24 (ECF No. 56 at 15).

25 Local Rule IC 2-2(b) provides, in relevant part, “[f]or each type of relief requested or
26 purpose of the document, a separate document must be filed and a separate event must be selected
27 for that document.” LR IC 2-2(b). Plaintiff’s combining her response to defendants’ motion with
28 her own cross-motion for summary judgment violates LR IC 2-2(b), and therefore the court will

1 not recognize plaintiff's response insofar as it purports to include a separate motion for summary
2 judgment. If plaintiff wishes to file her own motion for summary judgment, she may do so via a
3 separate filing.

4 Accordingly, because the parties' stipulation intends to grant defendants' additional time
5 to respond to plaintiff's "motion," the court will deny the stipulation as moot. However, to the
6 extent that defendants intend to file a reply to plaintiff's response to the motion for summary
7 judgment (ECF No. 45), the court will grant defendants until January 4, 2019, as contemplated by
8 the parties' stipulation.

9 Accordingly,

10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' second stipulation for extension of time (ECF
11 No. 61) be, and the same hereby, is DENIED.

12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendants shall have until January 4, 2019, to file their
13 reply to the motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 45).

14 DATED December 21, 2018.

15 
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28